REMARKS

Claims 17, 30 and 36 have been amended and new claims 45-47 have been added. No claims have been canceled by way of this response. Thus, claims 17-18, 20, 26-28, 30, 31, 33-47 are currently pending and presented for examination. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Response to Claim Objections:

The Examiner has objected to claims 17, 18, 20, 37-40, 42 and 43 for informalities. Applicant has corrected the informalities and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objections.

The Examiner has objected to claim 36 for improper dependency. Applicant has corrected the dependency and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objections.

Response to Rejections Under Section 103:

Claims 17, 18, 20, 26-28, 30, 31 and 33-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a), the Examiner contending that these claims are obvious over Golla et al (USPN 6,587,874) in view of O'Toole et al. (USPN 6,345,294). Claims 18, 31 and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a), the Examiner contending that these claims are obvious over Golla in view of O'Toole and Skemer et al. (USPN 6,570,849). Claims 41-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a), the Examiner contending that these claims are obvious over Golla in view of O'Toole, Skemer, and Choudhry (USPN 6,442,602).

Applicant's Claim 17 recites:

> transmitting a request message comprising the stored domain name
> to a domain name system server by the device, wherein the domain
> name system server is used to convert between domain names and
> Internet protocol addresses and to look up address information of a
> parameter server based on the transmitted domain name;

Thus, a domain name sent to the domain name server is used to provide address information of a parameter server. The Examiner indicates Golla teaches transmitting a request message (207 and 232 in figure 2A) comprising the stored domain name to a domain name

server (DHCP server 24 and DNS server 240 in figure 2A) by the device (network device 12 in figure 2A). However, Golla teaches transmitting a request message comprising the IP address in order to resolve its name (see e.g., col 3 lines 21-22).

The Examiner also indicates that Golla teaches wherein the domain name system server is used to convert between domain names and Internet protocol addresses (DHCP server provides IP addresses based on the network device request and DNS server provides device name per the IP address attained, see, e.g., col. 6, lines 10-22 and figure 2A, 207, 211, 232 and 234). However, Golla teaches a device that sends a DHCP request in order to learn its own IP addresses, (see e.g, col. 3 lines 7-20). Golla does not teach or suggest a conversion between the domain name and IP address but simply a dynamically assigned IP address. Furthermore, Golla teaches that the IP address must be known in order to obtain the domain name.

Moreover, the Examiner cites Golla's DHCP server, DNS server, and TFTP servers as Applicant's domain name server. The Examiner states "It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine three servers (DHCP, DNS and TFTP servers) as taught by Golla into on DNS server in order to efficiently centralize multiple functionalities together. However, each of Golla's servers is based on well established separate protocols. The DHCP server is based on a Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol (see e,g., RFC 2131). The DNS server is based on a Domain Name System/Server (see e.g., RFC 1034). TFTP is based on a Trivial File Transfer Protocol (see e.g., RFC 1350). Because of the separate protocols, Golla teaches sending separate messages to each server. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that even if the capability of the servers were combined, Golla does not teach or suggest that the messages and/or the protocols would be combined in order to transfer a single message.

In view of the above, independent claim 17 is patentable. Independent claims 26 and 30 which have similar limitations are also patentable. Furthermore claims 18, 20, 37-40, 42 and 43 which depend on claim 17, claims 27, 28, 41, and 44 which depend on claim 26 and claims 31, 33-36 which depend on claim 30 are also patentable at least based on their dependency as well as based on their own merits. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the Section 103 rejections.

Response to Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Provisional Rejection:

The Examiner rejected claims 17, 26, 30 and 31 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting, stating that although the subject matter of these claims is not identical to claims 15, 27 and 28 of copending Application No. 10/884,485, the pending claims are not patentably distinct from these claims.

While Applicant does not acquiesce to the grounds of the rejection, Applicant submits the accompany Terminal Disclaimer in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.321(b) and 3.73(b) in order to promptly resolve this issue. Withdrawal of the double patenting rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the objections and rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action are inapplicable to the present claims. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the objections and rejections and timely pass the application to allowance. Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this paper. The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including fees for additional claims and terminal disclaimer fee, or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 05-08-2008

By: _Janet D. Hood_

Janet D. Hood
Registration No. 61,142
(407) 736-4234

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830